

**State of Florida  
Department of Children and Families**



**ITN# - SNR1819RS001  
Adult Education Services for  
Refugees and Entrants in Miami-Dade County**

**Evaluation Manual**

Evaluator Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Vendor Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Reply Evaluation: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

## 1 GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

- 1.1 Each evaluator will evaluate the programmatic reply for all Vendor replies that pass the mandatory criteria. Each evaluation criterion must be scored. Fractional values will not be accepted. If an evaluator score sheet is missing scores, it will be returned for completion. Scoring must reflect the evaluator's independent evaluation of the reply to each evaluation criterion.
- 1.2 Each evaluator shall assign a score for each evaluation criterion based upon his/her assessment of the reply. The assignment of an individual score must be based upon the following description of the point scores:

IF, in your judgment the reply demonstrates and/or describes...	Category	...assign points within ...
...extensive competency, proven capabilities, an outstanding approach to the subject area, innovative, practical and effective solutions, a clear and complete understanding of inter-relationships, full responsiveness, a clear and comprehensive understanding of the requirements and planning for the unforeseen.	Superior / Excellent	81-100% of the maximum points for the area.
...clear competency, consistent capability, a reasoned approach to the subject area, feasible solutions, a generally clear and complete description of inter-relationships, extensive but incomplete responsiveness and a sound understanding of the requirements.	Good	61-80% of the maximum points for the area.
...fundamental competency, adequate capability, a basic approach to the subject area, apparently feasible but somewhat unclear solutions, a weak description of inter-relationships in some areas, partial responsiveness, a fair understanding of the requirements and a lack of staff experience and skills in some areas.	Adequate	41-60% of the maximum points for the area.
...little competency, minimal capability, an inadequate approach to the subject area, infeasible and/or ineffective solutions, somewhat unclear, incomplete and /or non-responsive, a lack of understanding of the requirements and a lack of demonstrated experience and skills.	Poor	21-40 %of the maximum points for the area.
...a significant or complete lack of understanding, an incomprehensible approach, a significant of complete lack of skill and experience and extensive non-responsiveness.	Insufficient	0-20% of the maximum points for the area.

- 1.3 When completing score sheets evaluators should record references to the sections of the Invitation to Negotiate (ITN) and the written reply materials which most directly pertain to the criterion and upon which their scores were based. More than one section may be recorded. Evaluators should not attempt an exhaustive documentation of every bit of information considered but only key information. In general, the reference statements should be brief. If the reply does not address an evaluation criterion, evaluators should indicate "not addressed" and score it accordingly.
- 1.4 Each evaluator has been provided a copy of the ITN, including its appendices, any ITN amendments, and Vendor written inquiries and the written responses provided by the Department. Each evaluator will also be provided with a copy of each programmatic reply which should be evaluated and scored according to the instructions provided in the solicitation and the evaluation manual.
- 1.5 Replies shall be independently scored by each member of the evaluation team. No collaboration is permitted during the scoring process. The same scoring principles must be applied to every reply received, independent of other evaluators. Evaluators should work carefully to be as thorough as possible in order to

ensure a fair and open competitive procurement. No attempt by Department personnel or others, including other evaluators, to influence an evaluator's scoring shall be tolerated.

- 1.6 If any attempt is made to influence an evaluator, the evaluator must immediately report the incident to the Procurement Manager. If such an attempt is made by the Procurement Manager, the evaluator must immediately report the incident to the Inspector General.
- 1.7 Only the rating sheets provided should be used. No additional notes or marks should appear elsewhere in the evaluation manual.
- 1.8 Evaluators may request assistance in understanding evaluation criteria and replies only from the Procurement Manager.
- 1.9 Questions related to the solicitation and the evaluations of the reply should be directed only to:  
David Draper, Procurement Manager  
Florida Department of Children and Families, Refugee Services Program  
400 W. Robinson St., Suite 1111A  
Orlando, FL 32801  
E-Mail Address: David.Draper@myflfamilies.com
- 1.10 After each evaluator has completed the scoring of each programmatic reply, the scores are then submitted to the Procurement Manager for compilation. The Procurement Manager will average the total programmatic point scores by each evaluator to calculate the points awarded for each section.
- 1.11 Following completion of the independent evaluations of the replies, the Procurement Manager will hold a meeting to validate evaluator scoring. The purpose of the meeting is to ensure that each individual's evaluation scores were captured correctly when preparing the total programmatic scores.

## 2 SELECTION CRITERIA

Evaluators shall assign scores to each of the replies received by the Department based on the following criteria:

- The Vendor's articulation of its approach to providing the required services and the ability of the approach to meet the requirements of this ITN and provide additional value.
- The Vendor's experience and capability to deliver its proposed services including the Vendor track record providing services similar to the ones specified in this ITN.
- The Vendor's company structure and the skills and experience of the Vendor's leadership team, staff, and resources the Vendor will use in implementing its services.
- *Financial Reply:* The Vendor's financial management approach, proposed budget and related financial information. (Note: *This criterion will be evaluated by the Procurement Manager and the Financial Evaluator. The Programmatic Evaluator will not evaluate or score the Financial Reply.*)

### 3 PROGRAMMATIC REPLY POINT VALUES AND FINANCIAL REPLY POINTS VALUES

The maximum score for the Programmatic Reply is 800 points.

The maximum score for the Financial Reply is 200 points.

Programmatic Criteria	Maximum Points	Percent of Total (1000 Points)
<b>1. The Vendor's articulation of its approach to providing the required services and the ability of the approach to meet the requirements of this ITN and provide additional value.</b>		
Services Approach and Solution	200	20%
Recruitment and Retention of Clients	50	5%
<b>Section 1 Subtotal</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>25%</b>
<b>2. The Vendor's experience and capability to deliver its proposed services including the Vendor track record providing services similar to the ones specified in this ITN.</b>		
Experience and track record	200	20%
Capability to Deliver Services (ability to achieve service unit goals, exceed performance measures, accommodate client needs, etc.)	200	20%
<b>Section 2 Subtotal</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>40%</b>
<b>3. The Vendor's company structure and the skills and experience of the Vendor's leadership team, staff, and resources the Vendor will use in implementing its services.</b>		
Organizational Structure, Staff, and Leadership Team	50	5%
Resources	50	5%
Collaboration (with Employment Providers and Other Entities)	50	5%
<b>Section 3 Subtotal</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>15%</b>

Financial Reply Criteria	Maximum Points	Percent of Total (200 Points)
<b>4. <i>Financial Reply:</i></b> The Vendor’s financial management approach, proposed budget and related financial information. (Note: <i>This criterion will be evaluated by the Procurement Manager and the Financial Evaluator. The Programmatic Evaluator shall <u>not</u> evaluate or score the Financial Reply</i> )		
Financial Stability / Financial Management	30	3%
Budget	140	14%
Cost Comparison	30	3%
<b>Section 4 Subtotal</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>20%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>1000</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Evaluation Criteria 1 – Sub Criteria 1**

<p><b>Criteria:</b> The Vendor's articulation of its approach to providing the required services and the ability of the approach to meet the requirements of this ITN and provide additional value.</p>
<p><b>Sub criteria:</b> Services Approach and Solution</p>
<p><b><i>ITN Programmatic Reply Instructions:</i></b> The Vendor shall describe its approach to performing the Service Component Tasks described in Sections 3.2.9 and the Performance Measures and Vendor Unique Activities found in Sections 3.2.23 – 3.2.25 and how it will meet all of the Department's detailed requirements. Specifically, the Vendor must explain in detail the methods it will use to develop, implement, and manage an adult education program in Miami-Dade County that includes all of the services outlined in this ITN. In order to facilitate the reply evaluation process, Vendors should format this reply section in a way that is clearly delineated for each of these service areas.</p>
<p><b><i>ITN Related Text:</i></b> ITN Sections 4.2.5, TAB4: SERVICES APPROACH AND SOLUTION (Sections A through T)</p>
<p><b><i>Guidance:</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Vendor extensively describes an excellent and comprehensive plan for providing exceptional ELI classes to eligible clients. The Vendor details when and where classes will take place. Locations and times are practical and convenient for clients. The Vendor describes the number of highly-qualified instructors/teachers that will be necessary to provide classes. The Vendor has plans to ensure that instructors/teachers are professionally qualified to provide classes. The Vendor has described the educational materials (books, workbooks) needed to provide classes.</li> <li>• If utilizing a voucher system, the Vendor does a superior job explaining in detail how it will administer vouchers to eligible refugees for ELI and/or vocational studies. The Vendor describes how it has established working relationships with partner organizations capable of providing ELI or vocational training. The Vendor has established a method of payment ensuring that the Vendor will reimburse partner organizations in a timely manner. The Vendor has included documentation of Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) or any other agreements. The Vendor explains in detail how its methods of selecting and entering into agreements (MOU) with partner organizations comply with Uniform Grant Guidelines.</li> <li>• The Vendor does an outstanding job extensively describing how it will administer excellent pre-test and post-test standardized assessments. The Vendor includes copies of all assessment instruments. The assessments are both appropriate and detailed. The Vendor describes how it will document student progress. The Vendor explains how it will use pre-test and post-test standardized assessments to appropriately place refugees in applicable ELI or vocational classes.</li> <li>• The Vendor describes a detailed plan for providing academic advising.</li> <li>• The Vendor describes an exceptional plan for outreach. The plan is comprehensive and describes where outreach activities will take place and with what frequency.</li> <li>• The Vendor describes an excellent plan for conducting intakes and eligibility determination. The Vendor thoroughly explains how it will enroll clients in ELI or vocational classes.</li> <li>• The Vendor describes exceptional supportive services or additional adult education services that it intends to provide. The Vendor's plan is detailed and the proposed services are beneficial.</li> </ul>

**Criteria:**  
The Vendor's articulation of its approach to providing the required services and the ability of the approach to meet the requirements of this ITN and provide additional value.

**Sub criteria:**  
Services Approach and Solution

**Notes/Rationale:**

**Score (0-200):** \_\_\_\_\_

**Evaluator Initials:** \_\_\_\_\_

Topic	Max Points	Superior (81-100%)	Good (61-80%)	Adequate (41-60%)	Poor (21-40%)	Insufficient (0-20%)
• Services Approach and Solution	200					

**Evaluation Criteria 1 – Sub Criteria 2**

<p><b>Criteria:</b> The Vendor's articulation of its approach to providing the required services and the ability of the approach to meet the requirements of this ITN and provide additional value.</p>
<p><b>Sub criteria:</b> Recruitment and Retention of Clients</p>
<p><b>ITN Programmatic Reply Instructions:</b> The Vendor shall describe its approach to performing the Service Component Tasks described in Sections 3.2.9 and the Performance Measures and Vendor Unique Activities found in Sections 3.2.23 – 3.2.25 and how it will meet all of the Department's detailed requirements. Specifically, the Vendor must explain in detail the methods it will use to develop, implement, and manage an adult education program in Miami-Dade County that includes all of the services outlined in this ITN. In order to facilitate the reply evaluation process, Vendors should format this reply section in a way that is clearly delineated for each of these service areas.</p>
<p><b>ITN Related Text:</b> ITN Sections 4.2.5, 4.2.5.R</p>
<p><b>Guidance:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Vendor has formulated an exemplary plan for maintaining client enrollment.</li> <li>• The Vendor has a specific, achievable, well-thought-out plan for addressing high refugee withdrawal rates.</li> <li>• The Vendor describes a comprehensive and excellent plan for re-enrolling clients that have withdrawn due to becoming employed.</li> <li>• The Vendor details an outstanding plan for motivating refugees to advance to higher levels of ELI.</li> <li>• The Vendor describes creative and innovative ways to re-engage clients that are no longer attending classes regularly.</li> <li>• The Vendor describes alternative methods/models of teaching that increase client enrollment and help retain clients in classes.</li> </ul>



**Criteria:**  
The Vendor's articulation of its approach to providing the required services and the ability of the approach to meet the requirements of this ITN and provide additional value.

**Sub criteria:**  
Recruitment and Retention of Clients

**Notes/Rationale:**

**Score (0-50):** \_\_\_\_\_

**Evaluator Initials:** \_\_\_\_\_

Topic	Max Points	Superior (81-100%)	Good (61-80%)	Adequate (41-60%)	Poor (21-40%)	Insufficient (0-20%)
• Recruitment & Retention of Clients	50					

**Evaluation Criteria 2 – Sub Criteria 1**

<p><b>Criteria:</b> The Vendor’s experience and capability to deliver its proposed services including the Vendor track record providing services similar to the ones specified in this ITN</p>
<p><b>Sub criteria:</b> Experience and Track Record</p>
<p><b>ITN Programmatic Reply Instructions:</b> The Vendor shall describe its approach to performing the Service Component Tasks described in Sections 3.2.9 and the Performance Measures and Vendor Unique Activities found in Sections 3.2.23 – 3.2.25 and how it will meet all of the Department’s detailed requirements. Specifically, the Vendor must explain in detail the methods it will use to develop, implement, and manage an adult education program in Miami-Dade County that includes all of the services outlined in this ITN. In order to facilitate the reply evaluation process, Vendors should format this reply section in a way that is clearly delineated for each of these service areas.</p> <p><b>AND</b></p> <p>Company Qualifications and Experience (Evaluators please refer to Section 4.2.6 for more details on these instructions)</p>
<p><b>ITN Related Text:</b> ITN Sections 4.2.5, 4.2.5(S), 4.2.5(T), 4.2.6</p>
<p><b>Guidance:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the table found on page 1 of this Evaluation Manual and take into account the following guidelines when evaluating “substantial experience” discussed in the next four (4) questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 10 or more years of experience = Superior</li> <li>- 5 to 10 years of experience = Good</li> <li>- 2 to 5 years of experience = Adequate</li> <li>- 1 year of experience or less = Poor</li> <li>- 0 years of experience = Insufficient</li> </ul> </li> <li>• (1) The Vendor has substantial experience providing services to refugees and entrants.</li> <li>• (2) The Vendor has substantial experience providing ELI classes and/or adult education classes to the refugee and entrant population.</li> <li>• (3) The Vendor has substantial experience directly providing ELI classes.</li> <li>• (4) The Vendor has substantial experience doing business in Florida.</li> <li>• Based on its experience and track record, the Vendor has the realistic capacity to serve a large number of refugees.</li> <li>• When considering contract reviews and monitoring, the Vendor has an excellent track record over the last five (5) years with very few, if any, negative findings.</li> </ul>

**Criteria:**  
The Vendor's experience and capability to deliver its proposed services including the Vendor track record providing services similar to the ones specified in this ITN

**Sub criteria:**  
Experience and Track Record

**Notes/Rationale:**

**Score (0-200):** \_\_\_\_\_

**Evaluator Initials:** \_\_\_\_\_

Topic	Max Points	Superior (81-100%)	Good (61-80%)	Adequate (41-60%)	Poor (21-40%)	Insufficient (0-20%)
• Experience and Track Record	200					

**Evaluation Criteria 2 – Sub Criteria 2**

<p><b>Criteria:</b> The Vendor’s experience and capability to deliver its proposed services including the Vendor track record providing services similar to the ones specified in this ITN</p>
<p><b>Sub criteria:</b> Capability to Deliver Services (ability to achieve service unit goals, exceed performance measures, accommodate client needs, etc.)</p>
<p><b><i>ITN Programmatic Reply Instructions:</i></b> The Vendor shall describe its approach to performing the Service Component Tasks described in Sections 3.2.9 and the Performance Measures and Vendor Unique Activities found in Sections 3.2.23 – 3.2.25 and how it will meet all of the Department’s detailed requirements. Specifically, the Vendor must explain in detail the methods it will use to develop, implement, and manage an adult education program in Miami-Dade County that includes all of the services outlined in this ITN. In order to facilitate the reply evaluation process, Vendors should format this reply section in a way that is clearly delineated for each of these service areas.</p> <p><b>AND</b></p> <p>Company Qualifications and Experience (Evaluators please refer to Section 4.2.6 for more details on these instructions)</p>
<p><b><i>ITN Related Text:</i></b> ITN Sections 4.2.5, 4.2.5(S), 4.2.5(T), 4.2.5(U), 4.2.6</p>
<p><b><i>Guidance:</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Based on the Vendor’s past experiences in achieving similar results, the proposed number of service units is realistic, reasonable, and will meet the Department’s goals.</li> <li>• The Vendor provides a thoughtful and superb narrative describing how the number of service units was determined and how they are achievable.</li> <li>• Considering its past experience in achieving similar results, the Vendor has proposed performance measure percentages that are both reasonable and achievable. The Vendor has adequately justified its reasoning for each proposed percentage.</li> <li>• The reply describes the Vendor’s excellent and thorough process for tracking, meeting, and exceeding all of the sample deliverables and performance measures.</li> <li>• The Vendor has explained in detail its “electronic management information capability” and how it will assist the Vendor in completing all reporting requirements.</li> <li>• Based on the Vendor’s past experiences and current qualifications, the Vendor appears to have the capacity to expertly and excellently deliver all of the required services.</li> </ul>

**Criteria:**  
The Vendor's experience and capability to deliver its proposed services including the Vendor track record providing services similar to the ones specified in this ITN

**Sub criteria:**  
Capability to Deliver Services (ability to achieve service unit goals, exceed performance measures, accommodate client needs, etc.)

*Notes/Rationale:*

**Score (0-200):** \_\_\_\_\_

**Evaluator Initials:** \_\_\_\_\_

Topic	Max Points	Superior (81-100%)	Good (61-80%)	Adequate (41-60%)	Poor (21-40%)	Insufficient (0-20%)
• Capability to Deliver Services	200					

**Evaluation Criteria 3 – Sub Criteria 1**

<p><b>Criteria:</b> The Vendor's company structure and the skills and experience of the Vendor's leadership team, staff, and resources the Vendor will use in implementing its services</p>
<p><b>Sub criteria:</b> Organizational Structure, Staff, and Leadership Team</p>
<p><b>ITN Programmatic Reply Instructions:</b> Company Qualifications and Experience (Evaluators please refer to Section 4.2.6 for more details on these instructions)</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Core Team Qualifications (Evaluators please refer to Section 4.2.7 for more details on these instructions)</p>
<p><b>ITN Related Text:</b> ITN Section 4.2.6 and 4.2.7</p>
<p><b>Guidance:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Vendor proposes to hire an appropriate number of qualified staff members sufficient to meet the goals of the Department and the needs of the clients.</li> <li>• The Vendor describes an exceptional approach to the recruitment, training, supervision, and retention of qualified personnel.</li> <li>• The Vendor describes any special qualifications/certifications necessary for instructors/teachers responsible for teaching ELI or vocational courses.</li> <li>• Staff and service sites will be appropriately dispersed throughout the service area in a manner that benefits refugees in need of adult education services.</li> <li>• The Vendor's proposed onsite staff members have the relevant linguistic capability and cultural competency in relation to the population to be served.</li> <li>• The Vendor superbly describes the activities that each staff member will be performing on a regular basis. Activities conducted by staff are both reasonable and necessary.</li> <li>• The Vendor describes a superior management team that is qualified (strong, organized, capable, responsible, goal-driven) to lead their organization in meeting the needs of the ITN.</li> <li>• The Vendor has demonstrated a reasonably low employee turnover rate over the last three years.</li> <li>• The Vendor presents evidence showing that it historically meets or exceeds performance expectations on a consistent basis.</li> <li>• The Vendor has previous experience achieving positive outcomes for its clients.</li> <li>• The Vendor provides evidence of proactive and timely management of any audits, reviews, and/or monitoring results. The Vendor's response to any findings was exceptional (prompt, thorough, and appropriate).</li> <li>• The Vendor's monitoring results and performance reviews have been primarily positive in nature.</li> <li>• The Vendor provides a detailed "organizational chart" that clearly delineates leadership roles and demonstrates the Vendor's capability to effectively and efficiently deliver these services.</li> <li>• The Vendor's organizational structure indicates stable operational and administrative support for this project. The Administrative model appears to be both efficient and effective.</li> <li>• The Vendor has a superior administrative organizational structure to fulfill all the responsibilities under the contract, including program oversight and management of information systems.</li> </ul>

**Criteria:**  
The Vendor's company structure and the skills and experience of the Vendor's leadership team, staff, and resources the Vendor will use in implementing its services

**Sub criteria:**  
Organizational Structure, Staff, and Leadership Team

**Notes/Rationale:**

**Score (0-50):** \_\_\_\_\_

**Evaluator Initials:** \_\_\_\_\_

Topic	Max Points	Superior (81-100%)	Good (61-80%)	Adequate (41-60%)	Poor (21-40%)	Insufficient (0-20%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Organizational Structure, Staff and Leadership Team</li> </ul>	50					

**Evaluation Criteria 3 – Sub Criteria 2**

<p><b>Criteria:</b> The Vendor's company structure and the skills and experience of the Vendor's leadership team, staff, and resources the Vendor will use in implementing its services</p>
<p><b>Sub criteria:</b> Resources</p>
<p><b>ITN Programmatic Reply Instructions:</b> The Vendor shall provide a brief executive overview demonstrating an understanding of the ITN purpose stated in Section 1.2, and the needs specified in this ITN. The Vendor shall also demonstrate a strong understanding of the overall goals of the program. The Executive Overview should include a brief description of the Vendor's organization, leadership credentials, approach for Scope of Work services, management of Performance Specifications, and completing Deliverables as defined in this ITN.</p> <p><b>AND</b></p> <p>The Vendor shall describe its approach to performing the Service Component Tasks described in Sections 3.2.9 and the Performance Measures and Vendor Unique Activities found in Sections 3.2.23 – 3.2.25 and how it will meet all of the Department's detailed requirements. Specifically, the Vendor must explain in detail the methods it will use to develop, implement, and manage an adult education program in Miami-Dade County that includes all of the services outlined in this ITN. In order to facilitate the reply evaluation process, Vendors should format this reply section in a way that is clearly delineated for each of these service areas.</p> <p><b>AND</b></p> <p>Company Qualifications and Experience (Evaluators please refer to Section 4.2.6 for more details on these instructions)</p>
<p><b>ITN Related Text:</b> ITN Sections 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.6</p>
<p><b>Guidance:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Vendor does an exceptional job providing other services to refugees in the service area.</li> <li>• The Vendor does an outstanding job providing other types of services in the service area that will benefit refugees.</li> <li>• Will refugees receive any complimentary benefits from attending on-site classes with the Vendor? For example, will other refugee or refugee-related services be offered on-site? Will the Vendor offer on-site child care?</li> <li>• The Vendor's proposed service site locations are convenient and easily accessible by clients.</li> <li>• The Vendor proposed service times are varied and convenient for clients.</li> <li>• The Vendor has extensively researched and explored outside resources (i.e. other organizations offering ELI or vocational training) in the local community. If administering vouchers, the Vendor has reached out to relevant organizations in the community and has created working relationships.</li> <li>• The Vendor describes extensive partnerships with other organizations that will benefit clients.</li> </ul>



**Criteria:**  
The Vendor's company structure and the skills and experience of the Vendor's leadership team, staff, and resources the Vendor will use in implementing its services

**Sub criteria:**  
**Resources**

**Notes/Rationale:**

**Score (0-50):** \_\_\_\_\_

**Evaluator Initials:** \_\_\_\_\_

Topic	Max Points	Superior (81-100%)	Good (61-80%)	Adequate (41-60%)	Poor (21-40%)	Insufficient (0-20%)
• Resources	50					

**Evaluation Criteria 3 – Sub Criteria 3**

<p><b>Criteria:</b> The Vendor’s company structure and the skills and experience of the Vendor’s leadership team, staff, and resources the Vendor will use in implementing its services</p>
<p><b>Sub criteria:</b> Collaboration (with Employment Providers and Other Entities)</p>
<p><b>ITN Programmatic Reply Instructions:</b></p> <p>The Vendor shall describe its approach to performing the Service Component Tasks described in Sections 3.2.9 and the Performance Measures and Vendor Unique Activities found in Sections 3.2.23 – 3.2.25 and how it will meet all of the Department’s detailed requirements. Specifically, the Vendor must explain in detail the methods it will use to develop, implement, and manage an adult education program in Miami-Dade County that includes all of the services outlined in this ITN. In order to facilitate the reply evaluation process, Vendors should format this reply section in a way that is clearly delineated for each of these service areas.</p>
<p><b>ITN Related Text:</b> ITN Sections 4.2.5, 4.2.5.I, 4.2.5.J</p>
<p><b>Guidance:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Vendor describes in detail excellent plan for coordinating services with the current refugee employment provider in Miami-Dade County.</li> <li>• The Vendor superbly describes its plan for referring appropriate clients to the refugee employment provider. The Vendor describes which clients will be referred and at what point in time the referral will take place. The Vendor describes how it will follow up with referred clients to ensure that they received the services that they needed.</li> <li>• The Vendor describes how it will partner with other entities/agencies to ensure that refugees and entrants receive the assistance and the services that they require. The Vendor presents any relevant MOUs, letters of support, or agreements with these entities/agencies.</li> </ul>

**Criteria:**  
The Vendor's company structure and the skills and experience of the Vendor's leadership team, staff, and resources the Vendor will use in implementing its services

**Sub criteria:**  
Collaboration (with Employment Providers and Other Entities)

**Notes/Rationale:**

**Score (0-50):** \_\_\_\_\_

**Evaluator Initials:** \_\_\_\_\_

Topic	Max Points	Superior (81-100%)	Good (61-80%)	Adequate (41-60%)	Poor (21-40%)	Insufficient (0-20%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Collaboration (With Employment Providers and Other Entities)</li> </ul>	50					

Financial Reply Criteria – Sub Criteria 1

<p><b>Criteria:</b> The Vendor’s financial management approach, proposed budget and related financial information. (Note: <i>This criterion will be evaluated by the Procurement Manager and the Financial Evaluator. The Programmatic Evaluator shall not evaluate or score the Financial Reply</i>)</p>
<p><b>Sub criteria:</b> Financial Stability / Financial Management</p>
<p><b>ITN Financial Reply Instructions:</b> The Vendor must describe its current financial management and accounting systems and capability by submitting copies of their independent financial and compliance audit report and/or certified financial statements for the two (2) most recent fiscal years. These documents must be contained in a 3-ring binder, separate from the rest of the proposal. The copies shall include all applicable financial statements, auditor’s reports, management letters, and any corresponding re-issued audit components. If the Vendor does not have audit reports for the two most recent years, reviewed or compiled financial statements with the applicable Certified Public Accountant’s report shall be submitted. A newly created entity shall submit the requested financial reports from each of the founding collaborative partners.</p>
<p><b>ITN Related Text:</b> ITN Section 4.3.2</p>
<p><b>Guidance:</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>FINANCIAL STABILITY</u></b></p> <p>Copies of Vendors’ independent financial and compliance audit reports and/or certified financial statements for the two most recent fiscal years. The copies should include all applicable financial statements, auditor’s reports, management letters, and any corresponding re-issued audit components. If the Vendor does not have audit reports for the two most recent years, reviewed or compiled financial statements with the applicable Certified Public Accountant’s report should be submitted. <u>A newly created entity should submit the requested financial reports from each of the founding collaborative partners.</u> Procedure for determining a score for financial stability where two or more agencies have come together to create a new entity: Score each agency’s financial and compliance audits and/or certified financial statements, or where Vendors were not subject to audit requirements, their financial statements, independently of the other agencies. Once a score has been determined for each agency participating in the newly created entity, total their scores and divide by the number of participating agencies to arrive at an average score.</p>

**Criteria:**  
The Vendor's financial management approach, proposed budget and related financial information. (Note: This criterion will be evaluated by the Procurement Manager and the Financial Evaluator. The Programmatic Evaluator shall not evaluate or score the Financial Reply)

**Sub criteria:**  
**Financial Stability / Financial Management**

**Notes/Rationale:**

**Considerations:** Please assign the point value achieved in each section below. The total score for sections a-f shall be used on the following Rating Sheet Summary Page for Financial Stability to assign the corresponding points.

<b><u>A Current Ratio</u></b> (Total Current Assets divided by Total Current Liabilities) 1.75 or greater                      5 points 1.25 or greater, but less than 1.75    3 points Greater than 1.00 but less than 1.25    1 point Less than or equal to 1.00                0 points	a) Most Recent Year	
	b) 2 <sup>nd</sup> Most Recent Year	
<b><u>Months of Working Capital</u></b> (Total Current Assets Less Total Current Liabilities for the year divided by one twelfth of the total expenses for the year as of the date of the financial statement) 1.75 or greater                      5 points 1.25 or greater, but less than 1.75    3 points Greater than 0.80 but less than 1.25    1 point Less than or equal to 0.80                0 points	c) Most Recent Year	
	d) 2 <sup>nd</sup> Most Recent Year	
<b><u>Independent Auditor's Report, Financial Statement Opinion</u></b> Financial Statements "present fairly..."                      5 points Financial Statements "present fairly...except (minor)    3 points Financial Statements "present fairly...except (major)    1 point Unaudited Financial Statements presented                      1 point Financial Statements "do not present fairly..."                0 points	e) Most Recent Year	
	f) 2 <sup>nd</sup> Most Recent Year	
(Total Possible = 30) <b>ADDED SCORES:</b>		

**Score (0-30):** \_\_\_\_\_

**Evaluator Initials:** \_\_\_\_\_

Topic	Max Points	Superior (81-100%)	Good (61-80%)	Adequate (41-60%)	Poor (21-40%)	Insufficient (0-20%)
• Financial Stability / Financial Management	30					

**Financial Reply Criteria – Sub Criteria 2**

<p><b>Criteria:</b> The Vendor’s financial management approach, proposed budget and related financial information. (Note: <i>This criterion will be evaluated by the Procurement Manager and the Financial Evaluator. The Programmatic Evaluator shall not evaluate or score the Financial Reply</i>)</p>
<p><b>Sub criteria:</b> Budget</p>
<p><b><i>ITN Financial Reply Instructions:</i></b> The Vendor must submit detailed budget information. A Line Item Budget (Project Budget Summary), a Budget Narrative, and a Cost allocation Plan must all be submitted with the proposal. Each of these categories is described below. The actual budget documents can also be found at the end of the ITN in Appendix VII, VIII, and IX.</p>
<p><b><i>ITN Related Text:</i></b> ITN Section 4.3.3</p>
<p><b><i>Guidance:</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The financial reply includes an organized and thorough narrative that justifies each cost and explains how each cost was determined.</li> <li>• The Vendor includes an excellent and detailed Project Budget Summary (i.e. the line item budget). The Vendor clearly delineates proposed costs and describes all costs associated with ELI classes, vocational classes, vouchers, administration costs, and other costs.</li> <li>• All staff costs needed to operate the program are identified. Staff costs include a rate of pay, the amount of time devoted to the program, a narrative of fringe benefits provided and how they are determined, and a comparison of how the costs identified compare to other service providers in the service area offering similar services.</li> <li>• Allocations for personnel and any other line items in the Project Budget Summary are consistent with what was proposed in the Vendor’s programmatic reply.</li> <li>• The estimated cost for individual line items is reasonable, allowable, and necessary.</li> <li>• The Vendor submits an exceptional Cost Allocation Plan that identifies the distribution of costs between funding sources and divides individual costs by category.</li> <li>• The total amount for each federal fiscal year (FFY) is at or below the amount listed in Section 1.3 for all services in the Vendor’s reply.</li> <li>• The Vendor has described in detail how it arrived at its indirect cost rate. The Vendor explains its methodology and justifies the reasonableness of the proposed indirect cost rate.</li> </ul>

**Criteria:**  
The Vendor's financial management approach, proposed budget and related financial information. (Note: This criterion will be evaluated by the Procurement Manager and the Financial Evaluator. The Programmatic Evaluator shall not evaluate or score the Financial Reply)

**Sub criteria:**  
Budget

**Notes/Rationale:**

**Score (0-140):** \_\_\_\_\_

**Evaluator Initials:** \_\_\_\_\_

Topic	Max Points	Superior (81-100%)	Good (61-80%)	Adequate (41-60%)	Poor (21-40%)	Insufficient (0-20%)
• Budget	140					

**Financial Reply Criteria – Sub Criteria3**

<p><b>Criteria:</b> The Vendor's financial management approach, proposed budget and related financial information. (Note: <i>This criterion will be evaluated by the Procurement Manager and the Financial Evaluator. The Programmatic Evaluator shall not evaluate or score the Financial Reply</i>)</p>
<p><b>Sub criteria:</b> Cost Comparison</p>
<p><b>ITN Financial Reply Instructions:</b> N/A</p>
<p><b>ITN Related Text:</b> N/A</p>
<p><b>Guidance:</b> The Vendor's <i>cost per client served</i> as compared to the lowest proposed <i>cost per client served</i> from a Vendor providing similar services. The Department will first examine the Vendor's cost reply and determine the Vendor's overall cost for services for the entire contract period. The Department will then determine how many clients the Vendor proposes to serve during that same contract period. The Department will divide the overall cost for services by the overall number of clients that the Vendor proposes to serve. This will provide the Department with the <i>cost per client served</i>. The Department will then consider all Vendors that have submitted a reply and will determine the lowest average <i>cost per client served</i>. The lowest <i>cost per client served</i> will then be divided by each Vendor's <i>cost per client served</i>, and then multiplied by 30 to determine each Vendor's score for this criterion.</p>



**Criteria:**  
The Vendor's financial management approach, proposed budget and related financial information. (Note: This criterion will be evaluated by the Procurement Manager and the Financial Evaluator. The Programmatic Evaluator shall not evaluate or score the Financial Reply)

**Sub criteria:**  
Cost Comparison

**Notes/Rationale:**

The Procurement Manager will assign a score corresponding to the Vendor's *cost per client served* for the project (see explanation on previous page Guidance), relative to the lowest *cost per client served* of any responsive Vendor responding to this ITN. The following formula will be used to calculate the score for this criterion:

$$(Lowest\ Cost\ per\ Client\ Served / Vendor's\ Cost\ per\ Client\ Served) \times Total\ Possible\ Score = Vendor's\ Score$$

**Score (0-30):** \_\_\_\_\_

**Evaluator Initials:** \_\_\_\_\_

Topic	Max Points	Superior (81-100%)	Good (61-80%)	Adequate (41-60%)	Poor (21-40%)	Insufficient (0-20%)
• Cost Comparison	30					